

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT TACOMA

RYAN SCOTT ADAMS,

Plaintiff,

V.

BRUCE LANUM, et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 3:24-CV-5034-KKE-DWC

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
RECONSIDERATION

This prisoner civil rights action has been referred to United States Magistrate Judge

David W. Christel. Currently before the Court is Plaintiff Ryan Scott Adams's Motion for

Reconsideration for Appointed Counsel filed on January 3, 2025, Dkt. 42. As set forth below,

Plaintiff's Motion is denied because it is untimely and does not make the requisite showing for reconsideration of a court order.

On October 22, 2024, the Court denied Plaintiff's request for court-appointed counsel to assist in discovery (Dkt. 20 at 2) because Plaintiff did not show (1) this case involves complex facts or law; (2) an inability to articulate the factual basis of his claims in a fashion understandable to the Court; or (3) that the discovery in this case constitutes an extraordinary

circumstance warranting the appointment of counsel. *See* Dkt. 24 at 6–8. In seeking reconsideration of this decision, Plaintiff argues he has mental health disorders that make it difficult for him to proceed without counsel and alleges unfairness from disparity in his legal knowledge and that of defense counsel. Dkt. 42.

Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 7(h), motions for reconsideration are disfavored and will be denied absent a showing of manifest error or a showing of new facts or legal authority which could not have been presented earlier with reasonable diligence. *Id.* Importantly, the motion must be filed within fourteen days after the order to which it relates is filed. *Id.* Failure to comply with the fourteen-day deadline may be grounds for denial of the motion. *Id.*

Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration is untimely. Dkt. 42. The Court issued its Order on October 22, 2024. Dkt. 24. Any motion for reconsideration was due on or before November 5, 2024. *See* LCR. 7(h). Plaintiff did not file the Motion for Reconsideration until January 3, 2025. Dkt. 42. Moreover, Plaintiff has not shown appointment of counsel is necessary, nor has he supported his Motion with a showing of manifest error or of new facts or law that could not have been presented earlier with reasonable diligence.

Accordingly, Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration for Appointed Counsel (Dkt. 42) is denied.

Dated this 4th day of February, 2025.

David W. Christel
David W. Christel
United States Magistrate Judge